



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/542,908	04/04/2000	Hideto Yasuda	21. 1958/MS	6091
21171	7590	11/19/2003	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			DADA, BEEMNET W	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2131		
DATE MAILED: 11/19/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/542,908	YASUDA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Beemnet W Dada	2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 April 2000.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                 | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>5 &amp; 6</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. All claims have been examined. Claims 1-20 are pending

***Drawings***

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: reference sign 56, at page 7, line 22. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Objections***

3. Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: A period is missing at the end of the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 9, and 11-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dykes et al. (hereinafter referred to as Dykes) (U.S. Patent No. 5,872,915).

6. As per claim 1, Dykes teaches a user authentication device comprising of: a control unit controlling comparison (authentication) of identifying information input by a user with characteristic identifying information stored in a storage medium storing authentication information for applications corresponding to the characteristic identifying information (column 9, lines 7-21); and a set unit setting, as input information for an authentication system of one of the applications, authentication information of the one application the storage medium sends responsive to result of the comparison of the set unit (column 9, lines 20-28, and column 3, lines 45-53).

7. As per claim 4, Dykes teaches a user authentication system comprising of: a storage medium storing authentication information for application and characteristic identifying information (column 9, lines 7-21); a control unit comparing (authenticating) identifying information input by a user with the characteristic identifying information stored in the storage medium (column 9, lines 6-9); a set unit setting in one of the

applications selected by the user the authentication information the storage medium sends responsive to a result of the comparison to the set unit, as input information for authentication by the one selected application (column 9, lines 20-28, column 3, lines 45-53, and column 11, lines 32-38).

8. As per claim 6, Dykes teaches a process of user authentication, comprising: a control unit controlling comparison of identifying information input by a user with characteristic identifying information stored in a storage medium storing authentication information for applications corresponding to the characteristic identifying information (column 9, lines 7-21); and a set unit in one of the applications selected by the user the authentication information the storage medium sends responsive to a result of the comparison to the set unit as input information for the authentication system of the one selected application for authentication by the one selected application (column 9, lines 20-28, column 3, lines 45-53, and column 11, lines 32-38).

9. As per claim 8, Dykes teaches a computer authentication system comprising of: an interface unit exchanging information with an external device (column 7, lines 26-40); a memory unit storing identifying information for applications, the authentication information corresponding to the applications and characteristic identifying information (column 9, lines 7-21); a comparing unit comparing (authenticating) identifying information received from the external device with the stored characteristic information (column 9, lines 6-9); a processing unit supplying the authentication information for

applications to the external device in response to result of the comparison (column 9, lines 20-28, column 3, lines 45-53, and column 11, lines 32-38).

10. As per claim 9, Dykes teaches a computer authentication device comprising a process of: comparing identifying information input by a user with characteristic identifying information stored in a storage medium storing authentication information for applications (column 9, lines 7-21); and setting the authentication information the storage medium sends in response to a result of the comparison as input information to one of the applications for authentication (column 9, lines 20-28, and column 3, lines 45-53).

11. As per claim 11, Dykes teaches a user authentication device comprising of: a control unit controlling comparison (authentication) of identifying information input by a user with characteristic identifying information stored in a storage medium storing authentication information (column 9, lines 7-21); a set unit setting in one of the applications selected by the user the authentication information the storage medium sends responsive to a result of the authentication by the selected application (column 9, lines 20-28, column 3, lines 45-53, and column 11, lines 32-38); wherein the control unit further comprises: a providing unit providing the identifying information input by the user to the storage medium (column 9, lines 1-8); and a receiving unit receiving the result of the storage medium sends responsive to the result of comparison (column 8, lines 18-32); and wherein the storage medium further comprises a comparing unit comparing

the input identifying information provided to the storage medium with the characteristic identifying information stored in the storage medium (column 9, lines 7-10).

12. As per claim 12, Dykes as disclosed above in rejecting claim 11 teaches a user authentication device. Dykes further teaches a display unit displaying application names as a selection items (HTML Form) if the result of the comparison (authentication) is matching (column 11, lines 55-61 and lines 31-38); and a selecting unit controlling selection of one of the applications by the user, wherein the unit sets the authentication information of the selected application as input information to the selected application for authentication (column 11, lines 31-38, column 9, lines 20-28, and column 3, lines 45-53).

13. As per claim 13, Dykes as disclosed above in rejecting claim 12 teaches a user authentication device. Dykes further teaches a requesting unit requesting from the storage medium to send information about the applications, wherein the display controlling unit displays as the selection items the information received from the storage medium about the application in response to the request (column 9, lines 1-5, and column 11, lines 31-38).

14. As per claim 14, Dykes teaches a user authentication computer device comprising a process of: comparing (authentication) with a comparing unit identifying information input by a user with characteristic identifying information stored in a storage

medium storing authentication information for applications (column 9, lines 7-21); providing the identifying information input by the user to the storage medium (column 9, lines 1-8); receiving result of the comparison the storage medium sends responsive to a result of the comparison (column 9, lines 18-22); and setting, as input information for an authentication system of one of the applications, the authentication information the storage medium sends in response to the result of the comparison (column 9, lines 20-28, and column 3, lines 45-53).

15. As per claim 15, Dykes as disclosed above in rejecting claim 14 teaches a user authentication computer device. Dykes further teaches a method of selecting the one application from a selection items, wherein the process of setting comprises setting, as the input information for the authentication system of the selected one application, the authentication information of the selected one application (column 11, lines 31-38, column 9, lines 20-28, and column 3, lines 45-53).

16. As per claim 16, Dykes as disclosed above in rejecting claim 14 teaches a user authentication computer device. Dykes further teaches a method of generating a request to the storage medium to send information about the applications, wherein the display controlling unit displays as the selection items (HTML Form) the information about the application the storage medium sends in response to the request (column 9, lines 1-5, and column 11, lines 31-38).

Art Unit: 2131

17. As per claim 17, Dykes teaches a user authentication device, comprising: a storage medium storing characteristic identifying information and authentication information for applications and comparing identifying information input by a user with the characteristic identifying information stored in the storage medium (column 9, lines 7-21); and a set unit setting in one of the applications selected by the user the authentication information the storage medium sends to the set unit responsive to a result of the comparison as input information for authentication by the one selected application (column 9, lines 20-28, and column 3, lines 45-53, column 11, lines 32-38).

18. As per claim 18, Dykes teaches a user authentication device, comprising: a storage medium storing characteristic identifying information and authentication information for applications and comparing identifying information input by a user with the characteristic identifying information stored in the storage medium (column 9, lines 7-21); and a set unit setting, as input information for authentication system of one of the applications, the authentication information the storage medium sends to the set unit responsive to a result of the comparison (column 9, lines 20-28, and column 3, lines 45-53).

19. As per claim 19, Dykes teaches a user authentication device, comprising: a control unit controlling comparison of identifying information input by a user with characteristic identifying information stored in a storage medium storing authentication information for applications corresponding to the characteristic identifying information

(column 9, lines 7-21); and a set unit setting in one of the applications selected by the user the authentication information the storage medium sends responsive to a result of the comparison to the set unit as input information for authentication system of the one selected application for authentication by the one selected application (column 9, lines 20-28, and column 3, lines 45-53, column 11, lines 32-38).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

20. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

21. Claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 10 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dykes as applied to claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 9, and 11-19 above, and further in view of Cohen et al. (hereinafter referred to as Cohen) (U.S. Patent No. 6,178,511 B1).

22. As per claim 2, Dykes teaches a user authentication device, comprising: a control unit controlling comparison of identifying information input by a user with characteristic identifying information stored in a storage medium storing authentication information for applications corresponding to the characteristic identifying information (column 9, lines

7-21). Dykes does not explicitly teach an update unit for updating authentication information. However, Cohen teaches a single sign-on authentication system, comprising: an update unit controlling update of the authentication information of one of the application selected by the user to new authentication information input by the user responsive to a result of the comparison (column 7, lines 28-46); and a processing unit synchronously updating the authentication information stored in the selected application and the authentication information stored in the storage medium to the new authentication input by the user (column 7, lines 28-59). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the authentication device of Dykes so as to include an update unit for updating authentication information as per teachings of Cohen, because this modification further enables users to manage all passwords / certificates in a secure and effective manner as per teachings of Cohen.

23. As per claim 3, Dykes teaches a user authentication device, comprising: a control unit controlling comparison (authentication) identifying information input by a user with characteristic identifying information stored in a storage medium storing a plurality of authentication information for applications (column 9, lines 7-21); an instructing unit instructing the storage medium to send a desired authentication information in response to result of the comparison (column 9, lines 1-6); and a providing unit providing the authentication information sent from the storage medium to the application in response to the instruction (column 9, lines 18-29). Dykes does not explicitly teach a certificate

used as an authentication information. However, Cohen teaches a single sign-on authentication system where a device receives a certificate (public / private keys) from a storage unit for providing an application (column 6, lines 23-29, lines 38-45 and column 4, lines 44-48). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the authentication device of Dykes so as to include a certificate authentication method as per teachings of Cohen, because such modification will allow multiple authentication mechanisms to be configured on one machine, as per teachings of Cohen, Thus, giving an advantage of using such system.

24. As per claim 5, Dykes teaches a user authentication computer system, comprising: a storage medium storing authentication information for application and characteristic identifying information (column 9, lines 7-8); and a control unit comparing (authenticating) identifying information input by a user with the characteristic identifying information stored in the storage medium (column 9, lines 8-21). Dykes does not explicitly teach an update unit for updating authentication information. However, Cohen teaches a single sign-on authentication system, comprising: an update unit controlling update of the authentication information of one of the applications selected by the user to new authentication information input by the user responsive to a result of the comparison (column 7, lines 28-46); a processing unit synchronously updating the authentication information stored in the selected application and the authentication information stored in the storage medium to the new authentication information input by the user (column 7, lines 28-59). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the authentication device of Dykes so as to include an update unit for updating authentication information as per teachings of Cohen, because this modification further enables users to manage all passwords / certificates in a secure and effective manner as per teachings of Cohen.

25. As per claims 7 and 10, Dykes teaches a user authentication process, comprising: comparing identifying information input by a user with characteristic identifying information stored in a storage medium storing authentication information for applications (column 9, lines 7-21). Dykes does not explicitly teach an update process for updating authentication information. However, Cohen teaches a single sign-on authentication process, comprising: controlling update of the authentication information of one of the applications selected by the user to new authentication information input by the user responsive to a result of the comparison (column 7, lines 28-46); and synchronously updating the authentication information stored in the selected application and the authentication information stored in the storage medium to the new authentication information input by the user (column 7, lines 28-59). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the authentication device of Dykes so as to include an update unit for updating authentication information as per teachings of Cohen, because this modification further enables users to manage all passwords / certificates in a secure and effective manner as per teachings of Cohen.

26. As per claim 20, Dykes teaches a user authentication computer system, comprising: a storage medium storing characteristic identifying information and authentication information comparing identifying information input by a user with the characteristic identifying information stored in the storage medium (column 9, lines 7-21); and a set unit setting, as input information for authentication system of one of the applications, the authentication information the storage medium sends to the set unit responsive to a result of comparison (column 9, lines 20-28, and column 3, lines 45-53). Dykes does not explicitly teach a certificate used as an authentication information. However, Cohen teaches a single sign-on authentication system where a device receives a certificate (public / private keys) from a storage unit for providing an application (column 6, lines 23-29, lines 38-45 and column 4, lines 44-48). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the authentication device of Dykes so as to include a certificate authentication method as per teachings of Cohen, because such modification will allow multiple authentication mechanisms to be configured on one machine, as per teaching of Cohen, Thus, giving an advantage of using such system.

### ***Conclusion***

27. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2131

- a) U.S. Patent No. 5,684,950 to Dare et al., discloses a method and system for authenticating users to multiple computer servers via a single sign-on.
- b) U.S. Patent No. 5,611,048 to Jacobs et al., discloses a remote password administration for a computer network among a plurality of nodes sending a password update message to all nodes and updating on authorized nodes.
- c) U.S. Patent No. 6,629,246 B1 to Gadi, discloses a single sign-on for a network system that includes multiple separately-controlled restricted access resources.
- d) U.S. Patent No. 6,006,333 to Nielsen, discloses a password helper using a client-side master password which automatically presents the appropriate server-side password to a particular remote server.
- e) U.S. Patent No. 5,655,077 to Jones et al., discloses a method and system for authentication access to heterogeneous computing services.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Beemnet W Dada whose telephone number is (703) 305-8895. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00 am - 5:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R Sheikh can be reached on (703) 305-9648. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-5486.

Application/Control Number: 09/542,908  
Art Unit: 2131

Page 15

Beemnet Dada

November 12, 2003

*Ayaz Sheikh*  
AYAZ SHEIKH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100